



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/418,822	10/15/1999	YASUHISA ICHIFUJI	500.35360CX1	9381

20457 7590 12/26/2001

ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON, VA 22209

EXAMINER

LO, LINUS H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2614

DATE MAILED: 12/26/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/418,822

Applicant(s)

ICHIFUJI ET AL.

Examiner

Linus H Lo

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/22/2001, Amendment.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: *See Continuation Sheet*.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 12, 14-16, and 18 -20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler et al. ' 838 in view of Bedard '438 (both of record).

Considering claim 12(Amended) Lawler et al. discloses a program time guide for an interactive system. Lawler et al. disclose the following claimed limitations, note :

- 1) the claimed digital broadcasting receiver which displays video or a plurality of character information strings of programs when receiving digital broadcasting is met by the viewer stations 16 (column 5, lines 7-28, and column 6, lines 41-53, and FIG. 3);
- 2) the claimed omission display controller which omits a part of a character information string of a particular program when a number of characters in the character information string of the particular program is larger than a number of characters which can be displayed in a first prescribed zone is met by the description of interactive station controller 18 (column 8, lines 24-26 and 46-54 , FIG. 3) where FIG. 3 depicted an program title with the abbreviated title with a string of period "..." to indicate the abbreviation of the title which is considered as the omission; and
- 3) a full display controller which displays , in response to a predetermined selection , an entirety of the *character information string of the particular program in a second*

prescribed zone as described by the interactive station controller 18 (column 8, lines 24-26 and column 10, 16-41, and FIG. 3), where the described focus frame 102 is considered as the predetermined selection and the described program summary panel 108 includes the full title of the program 112 which is considered as the an entirety of the character information string of the program form which part omitted in a second prescribed zone.

However Lawler et al. does not explicitly disclose the claimed full display controller which displays an entirety of the character information string of the particular program **and time information of the particular program in a second prescribed zone.**

Nonetheless , Bedard discloses an electronic program guide with enhance presentation, where an intuitively operated electronic program guide which presents program guide information in table form at two levels of resolution. Bedard discloses the claimed full display controller which displays **an entirety of the character information string of the particular program and time information of the particular program in a second prescribed zone** which is met the control unit 330 as described at column 3, line 62-column 4, line 6 , column 5, lines 31-34 and Fig. 6, where the excerpts from columns 3,4, and 6 which teaches the electronic program guide information is displayed by utilizing the control unit 330, whereas the Fig. 6 depicted an overlaid display 602 (second prescribed zone) that includes the entire character information string of the program and its time information .

Since Bedard teaches the advantage of presenting an additional textual information as appeared to be magnified representation for the viewer-selected time slot which includes both

Art Unit: 2614

the program information and time information , whereat a conventional resolution television screen may present at least five hours of schedule information for eight channel, as elucidated in the abstract.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the advantage and the claimed full display controller which displays an entirety of the character information string of the particular program **and time information of the particular program in a second prescribed zone** , as taught by Bedard in the system of Lawler et al..

Considering claim 14(Amended) , the claimed select controller which select the character information string of the particular program from the plurality of character information strings of the programs is met by input device (column 10, lines 57-66, and 22-36, and FIG. 3), where the selected program by the focus frame would further render the program summary panel as depicted in FIG. 3 that consists the plurality of character information strings of the programs.

Consider claim 15(Amended), the claimed omission display controller adds an omission symbol to a remaining part of the character information string of the particular program from which a part was omitted when displaying the remaining part of the character information string of the program from which a part was omitted in the first prescribed zone is met by controller 18 (column 8, lines 24-26 and 46-54 , FIG. 3) where FIG. 3 depicted an program title

with the abbreviated title with a string of period “...”(omission symbol) to indicate the abbreviated title.

Considering claim 16, Lawler et al. discloses a program time guide for an interactive system. Lawler et al. discloses the following claimed limitations, note :

- 1) the claimed digital broadcasting receiver which displays video or a plurality of background information block indicative of program time when receiving digital broadcasting is met by the viewer stations 16 (column 5, lines 7-28, and column 6, lines 41-53, and FIG. 3);
- 2) the claimed display change controller which change a background information block indicative of program time when the background information block indicative of program time cannot be displayed in full in a first prescribed zone is met by the description of interactive station controller 18 (column 8, lines 24-26 and 46-54 , FIG. 3) where FIG. 3 depicted an program tile 88 with the abbreviated title with a string of period “...” to indicate the abbreviation of the title which is considered as the background information block indicative of program time cannot be displayed, while the program tile 88a which depicted the background information block indicative of program time be able displayed in full in a particular prescribed zone; and
- 3) a full display controller which displays , in response to a predetermined selection , *full program information* of the changed background information block indicative of program time in a second prescribed zone is met the interactive station controller 18 (

Art Unit: 2614

column 8, lines 24-26 and column 10, 16-41, and FIG. 3), where the described focus frame 102 is considered as the predetermined selection and the described program summary panel 108 includes the full title of the program 112 which is considered as the full program time information of the changed background information block indicative of program time in a second prescribed zone.

However, Lawler et al. does not explicitly teaches the claimed full display controller which displays , in response to a predetermined selection , **full program time information** of the changed background information block indicative of program time in a second prescribed zone .

Bedard discloses the claimed full display controller which displays , in response to a predetermined selection, **full program time information** of the changed background information block indicative of program time in a second prescribed zone which is met the control unit 330 as described at column 3, line 62 - column 4, line 6 , column 5, lines 31-34 and Fig. 6, where the excerpts from columns 3,4, and 6 which teaches the electronic program guide information is displayed by utilizing the control unit 330, whereas the Fig. 6 depicted an overlaid display 602 (second prescribed zone) that includes the entire character information string of the program and its time information .

Since Bedard teaches the advantage of presenting an additional textual information as appeared to be magnified representation for the viewer-selected time slot which includes both the program information and time information , whereat a conventional resolution television screen may present at least five hours of schedule information for eight channel, as elucidated in the abstract.

Art Unit: 2614

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the advantage and the claimed full display controller which displays , in response to a predetermined selection, **full program time information** of the changed background information block indicative of program time in a second prescribed zone, as taught by Bedard in the system of Lawler et al..

Considering claim 18 , the claimed select controller which select a background information block indicative of program time from the plurality of background information block indicative of program time is met by input device of Lawler et al. (column 10, lines 57-66, and 22-36, and FIG. 3), where the selected program by the focus frame would further render the program summary panel as depicted in FIG. 3 that consists the plurality of character information strings of the programs.

Considering claim 19 (New), the claimed limitation of wherein the time information of the particular program is a start time and an end time of the particular program is met by the description of Bedard at Fig. 6 , column 5, lines 31-34, whereas Fig. 6 clearly depicted the a start time and an end time of the particular program is displayed.

Considering claim 20 (New), the claimed limitation of wherein the character information string of the particular program is a title of the particular program is met by the full title of program 112 (Fig. 3 and column 10, ones 28-36) of Lawler et al. .

Art Unit: 2614

3. Claims 21, 23 (all New) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alten et al '978 in view of Bedard '438. (both of record).

Considering claim 21, Alten et al. discloses an electronic television program guide channel system and method. Alten et al. discloses the following claimed limitations, note :

- 1) the claimed digital broadcasting receiver which displays video or plurality of background information blocks each indicative of a program time period when receiving digital broadcasting is met by cable converter box 200 (column 14, lines 5-62, and Fig. 12 and 7c), and Fig. 7c depicts program guide grids indicative of a program time period which is displayed;
- 2) the claimed display controller which changes a displayed shape of a particular background information block indicative of a program time period when the program time period indicated by the particular background information block exceeds a program time period which can be displayed in a first prescribed zone is met by description at column 8, line 53 - column 9, line 6, and column 14, lines 5-15, where the described grid box is formed into an arrow pointing which is considered as the changing of a displayed shape of a particular background information block;

However, Alten et al. does not explicitly disclose the claimed full display controller which display, in response to a predetermined selection, a program start time and a program end time of the program time period indicated by the particular background information block in a second prescribed zone.

Art Unit: 2614

Nonetheless, Bedard discloses an electronic program guide with enhanced presentation. Bedard discloses the claimed full display controller which display, in response to a predetermined selection, a program start time and a program end time of the program time period indicated by the particular background information block in a second prescribed zone, which is met by the control unit 330 as described at column 3, line 62 - column 4, line 6, column 5, lines 31-34 and Fig. 6, where the excerpts from columns 3,4, and 6 that teach the electronic program guide information is displayed by utilizing the control unit 330, whereas the Fig. 6 depicted an overlaid display 602 (second prescribed zone) that clearly depicted the a start time and an end time of the particular program is displayed.

Since Bedard teaches the advantage of presenting an additional textual information as appeared to be magnified representation for the viewer-selected time slot which includes both the program information and time information, whereat a conventional resolution television screen may present at least five hours of schedule information for eight channel, as elucidated in the abstract.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the advantage and the claimed full display controller which display, in response to a predetermined selection, a program start time and a program end time of the program time period indicated by the particular background information block in a second prescribed zone, as taught by Bedard in the system of Alten et al.

Art Unit: 2614

Considering claim 23, the claimed select controller which selects the particular background information block from the plurality of background information blocks is met by IR remote control device (column 15, lines 7-12) of Alten et al..

4. Claims 13(Amended) and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler et al. and Bedard as applied to claims 12 and 16 ,respectively above, and further in view of Chang et al. '563 (all of record).

Considering claim 13, the system of Lawler et al. and Bedard discloses all the claimed limitations except for the claimed judge controller which judges whether a number of characters in the character information string of the particular program is larger than the number of character which can be displayed in the first prescribed zone.

Nonetheless, Lawler et al. teaches the selectively displaying the character information in full or in abbreviated in the first prescribed zone as depicted in FIG. 3 and column 8, lines 46-54, where tile 88 display the omitted part of character information string and while tile 88a display a full character information string.

Furthermore, Chang et al. discloses the claimed judge controller is met by the description at column 3, lines 37-42 and column 6, lines 18-39 and FIG. 8C, where the description at column 6 elucidated the function of judging whether a number of characters in the character information string of the particular program is larger than the number of character which can be displayed in the first prescribed zone.

Art Unit: 2614

Since it was known in the art that in order to selectively display a full character information string (full program title) or an omitted part of character information string (abbreviated character information string) in the grid type program guide (graphical user interface) as depicted in FIG. 3 of Lawler et al., where a judge controller which consists the judgement function would have been inherently included. Furthermore Chang et al. demonstrated it is well known in the art to recognize the claimed judge controller for display either the full character string or truncated character string in the grid formatted graphical user interface as discussed above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the claimed the claimed judge controller which judges whether a character information string of a program can be displayed in full in the first prescribed zone as taught by Chang et al. in the system of Lawler et al. and Bedard.

Considering claim 17, the system of Lawler et al. and Bedard discloses all the claimed limitations except for the claimed judge controller which judges whether a background information block indicative of program time can be displayed in full in the first prescribed zone.

Nonetheless, Lawler et al. teach the selectively displaying the abbreviated or full background information block of a program title for a particular time slot in the first prescribed zone as depicted in FIG. 3 and column 8, lines 46-54, where tile 88 display the omitted part of background information block and while tile 88a display a full background information block. Furthermore, Chang et al. disclose the judge controller which judges whether an information

Art Unit: 2614

block can be displayed in full in the first prescribed zone as described by the description at column 3, lines 37-42 and column 6, lines 18-39 and FIG. 8C, where the description at column 6 elucidated the function of judging whether the information block can be displayed in full in the first prescribed zone.

Since it was known in the art that in order to selectively display a full background information block (full program title) or an omitted part of character information string (abbreviated background information block) in the grid type program guide (graphical user interface) as depicted in FIG. 3 of Lawler et al., where a judge controller which consists the judgement function would have been inherently included. Furthermore Chang et al. demonstrated that it is well known in the art to recognize the claimed judge controller for display either the full information block or truncated information block in the grid formatted graphical user interface as discussed above. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the teaching of Chang et al. and further obviously rendered the recognition of the claimed judge controller which judges whether a background information block indicative of program time can be displayed in full in the first prescribed zone in the system of Lawler et al. and Bedard.

5. Claims 22(New) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alten et al. '978 and Bedard '438 as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of Chang et al..

Considering claim 22, the system of Alten et al. and Bedard discloses all the claimed limitations except for the claimed judge controller which judges whether a number of characters

Art Unit: 2614

in the character information string of the particular program is larger than the number of character which can be displayed in the first prescribed zone.

Nonetheless, Chang et al. discloses the claimed judge controller is met by the description at column 3, lines 37-42 and column 6, lines 18-39 and FIG. 8C, where the description at column 6 elucidated the function of judging whether a number of characters in the character information string of the particular program is larger than the number of character which can be displayed in the first prescribed zone.

Since it was known in the art that in order to selectively display a full character information string (full program title) or an omitted part of character information string (abbreviated character information string) in the grid type program guide (graphical user interface) as depicted in Fig. 5 of Bedard in the system of Alten et al. and Bedard, where a judge controller which consists the judgement function would have been inherently included. Furthermore Chang et al. demonstrated it is well known in the art to recognize the claimed judge controller for display either the full character string or truncated character string in the grid formatted graphical user interface as discussed above.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize the claimed judge controller which judges whether a character information string of a program can be displayed in full in the first prescribed zone as taught by Chang et al. in the system of Alten et al. and Bedard.

Art Unit: 2614

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12 and 16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

After further consideration and search, the combination of Lawler et al. and Bedard is considered to be applicable to the argued and amended claims, thus the new grounds of rejection is presented. It is noted that the combination of Alten et al. and Bedard is considered to be applicable to the newly presented claim 21. Please see the above new ground of art rejection.

It is noted that applicant has requested that the draftsperson provide a detailed explanation of the objection pointing out what the draftsperson considers to be solid black shading in Figs. 8-9.

It is informed that the element 503₁ and 503₂ in Fig. 8 and 9, which are considered to be solid black shading, whereof the Fig. will show crowding and unclear of those elements when the drawing is reduced in size two-thirds in reproduction. Thus the objection from the draftsman is maintained.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Linus H. Lo whose telephone number is (703) 305-4039.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Reinhard Eisenzopf, can be reached at (703) 305-4711.

Art Unit: 2614

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.


MICHAEL H. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

lhl 

December 19, 2001

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: copy of INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTET, paper # 4.